UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/797,237	03/10/2004	Paulus Antonius Augustinus Hofte	9177	2993	
27752 7590 02/25/2008 THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION - WEST BLDG.			EXAMINER		
			SPISICH, MARK		
WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 412 6250 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		3723			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/25/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/797,237	HOFTE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark Spisich	3723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 De	ecember 2007.					
<i>,</i> — · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
<i>;</i> —	· 					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application.						
, <u> </u>	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-9 and 14-31</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10-13</u> is/are rejected.	· ··· 					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<u> </u>	priority under 35 LLS C & 110(a)	-(d) or (f)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received					
		on No				
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Coo and attached dottall for a list of	2. 2 3334 33pi33 not 1330ivo					
Attachment(s)	.	(DTO 440)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/797,237 Page 2

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 1-9 and 14-31 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention/species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 27 April 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Specht (USP 6,260,226) in view of Fernandez (US PUB 2002/0162573). The patent to Specht discloses a cleaning implement comprising a handle (21), mop head (28) coupled to the handle by a universal joint and further including a locking mechanism (58) on one side of the connection betweeen the handle and the mop head. The patent to Specht discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of the added tool. The provision of an auxiliary cleaning tool to a mop is known in the art and is taught by Fernandez (#42, including scraper 42b and scrubbing pad 42a). In addition, Fernandez goes to great length to emphasize that the tool (42) is removable from the mop head (eg, paragraphs 0032 and 0033). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have provided such a tool to the device of Specht to help remove

Application/Control Number: 10/797,237 Page 3

Art Unit: 3723

stubborn debris. In addition, Fernandez discloses the (removable) cleaning tool (42) attached to a side of the mop head which is opposite the side of the mop head that is engaged with the handle in the wringing position (for example, see fig 6). That would suggest placing the (removable) cleaning tool (42) on the side of the mop head of Specht opposite that of the locking mechanism (58) with respect to the handle.

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Hussey (USP 558,074). The prior art discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of the handle and the head both including locking elements. The patent to Hussey discloses a cleaning implement with a universal joint and further including cooperating locking elements (H,J) on the head and the handle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have modified the device of Specht as such as it is an alternative locking structure disclosed as useful in a cleaning implement.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is first noted that applicant's comments with regard to Smith et al (USP 3,906,580) have been deemed persuasive and the rejection based thereof has been dropped. The rejection based on Specht (USP 6,260,226) in view of Fernandez (US PUB 2002/0162573) has been maintained. With regard to the tool being removable, Fernandez goes to great length to describe the auxiliary tool (42) as being removable from the mop head (paragraphs 0032 and 0033). With regard to the location of the cleaning tool relative to the handle and the locking mechanism,

Art Unit: 3723

Fernandez teaches locating the tool (42) on a side of the mop head (14) opposite the handle (12 and universal joint 24) relative to the portion (16a) of the head which is engaged with the handle when in the wringing position (fig 6). This position in Fernandez is analogous to the orientation shown in fig 6 of Specht. It is believed that Fernandez thus reasonably suggests location the additional tool on the mop head in the manner recited in claim 10.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Spisich whose telephone number is (571) 272-1278. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (5:30-3:00), Alternate Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Spisich/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3723 Mark Spisich Primary Examiner Art Unit 3723

/M. S./ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3723